	Case 3:07-cv-04536-JSW Document 7 Filed 03/	04/2008 Page 1 of 16	
1 2 3 4 5	Attorney General of the State of California DANE R. GILLETTE Chief Assistant Attorney General GERALD A. ENGLER Senior Assistant Attorney General JULIET B. HALEY Deputy Attorney General PEGGY S. RUFFRA Supervising Deputy Attorney General		
6 7 8 9	455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 San Francisco, CA 94102-3664 Telephone: (415) 703-1362 Fax: (415) 703-1234 Email: peggy.ruffra@doj.ca.gov		
10	IN THE UNITED STATES DIST	RICT COURT	
11	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT	OF CALIFORNIA	
12	SAN JOSE DIVISIO	N	
13	FLORENCIO VALLEJO,	07-4536 JSW	
14	4	OTION TO DISMISS	
15	5    H	ABEAS CORPUS PETITION S UNTIMELY	
16	DERRAL ADAMS, Warden,		
17 18	Respondent.		
19	Respondent hereby moves to dismiss the petition	n for writ of habeas corpus for failure to	
20	0 comply with the statute of limitations set forth in 28 U.S.C	. § 2244(d). A motion to dismiss in lieu	
21	of an answer on the merits is proper where the petition is pro	ocedurally defective. See White v. Lewis,	
22	874 F.2d 599, 602 (9th Cir. 1989); O'Bremski v. Maass, 915 F.2d 418, 420 (9th Cir. 1990); Rules		
23	Governing 28 U.S.C. § 2254 Cases, Rule 4, and Advisory Committee Notes.		
24	We have not noticed a hearing date because petition	oner is an incarcerated state prisoner who	
25	5 is representing himself in this case.		
26	STATEMENT OF THE CASE		
27	On November 15, 1999, petitioner pled guilty in Santa Clara County Superior Court to two		
28	8 counts of rape (Cal. Penal Code § 261(a)(2)), two counts of	lewd and lascivious acts on a child 14-15	
	Motion to Dismiss Habeas Corpus Petition as Untimely - C 07-4536 JSV		

6

7

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

2324

25

2627

28

years old (Cal. Penal Code § 288(c)(1)), lewd and lascivious acts on a child (Cal. Penal Code § 288(b)(1)), sodomy (Cal. Penal Code § 286(c)(2)), inflicting corporal injury on a spouse or cohabitant (Cal. Penal Code § 273.5), dissuading a witness (Cal. Penal Code § 136.1(c)(1), and misdemeanor child molestation (Cal. Penal Code § 647.6(a)). On February 25, 2000, the trial court sentenced petitioner to 40 years and four months in state prison. *See* Petition, Exh. 3, attached minute order.

Petitioner did not appeal. On May 22, 2000, petitioner filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in Santa Clara County Superior Court. Petition, exh. 1. On May 26, 2000, the superior court denied the petition. *Id*.

On July 17, 2000, petitioner filed a late notice of appeal. Petition, exh. 2. On August 22, 2000, petitioner filed an application for relief from default in the California Court of Appeal. Petition, exh. 3. On September 6, 2000, the appellate court denied the application. Petition, exh. 6; Resp. Exh. A.

On September 14, 2000, petitioner filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the California Supreme Court. Petition, exh. 7. On July 25, 2001, the supreme court denied the petition. Resp. Exh. B.

On July 29, 2004, petitioner filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in district court. On November 29, 2004, this Court dismissed the petition for failure to exhaust state remedies. Resp. Exh. C.

On November 30, 2006, petitioner filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the California Court of Appeal. On January 4, 2007, the appellate court denied the petition. Resp. Exh. D.

On January 17, 2007, petitioner attempted to file an untimely petition for review in the California Supreme Court. The clerk advised petitioner that he had submitted a defective petition and indicated he should submit an application for relief from default. Petition, exh. 8. When no application was submitted, on April 26, 2007, the court closed the case. Resp. Exh. E.

On August 31, 2007, petitioner filed the instant petition for writ of habeas corpus in district court. On January 8, 2008, this Court issued an Order to Show Cause.

### **ARGUMENT**

#### THE PETITION IS UNTIMELY

This case is governed by the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA), which imposed a one-year statute of limitations on the filing of federal habeas petitions. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). The limitations period commences on "the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review." 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(A). In this case, petitioner's state judgment became final on April 25, 2000, 60 days after sentencing, when the time to file a notice of appeal expired. Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.308(a). Thus, absent tolling, the federal petition was due by April 25, 2001. *See Patterson v. Stewart*, 251 F.3d 1243, 1246 (9th Cir. 2001).

The limitations period is tolled during the pendency of a properly filed state collateral challenge to the judgment. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2). Petitioner filed his first state collateral petition on May 22, 2000, and the statute was tolled continuously until the state supreme court denied relief on July 25, 2001, plus 30 days thereafter. Journal See Carey v. Saffold, 536 U.S. 214 (2002). Accordingly, the statutory deadline was extended by 459 days to July 28, 2002. However, petitioner did not file a federal petition by that date. His 2004 federal petition was late by two years, and also could not have tolled the statute under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2). See Duncan v. Walker, 533 U.S. 167, 172 (2001). His subsequent state habeas petitions were filed long after the limitations period had expired, and therefore did not toll the statute. Ferguson v. Palmateer, 321 F.3d 820, 823 (9th Cir. 2003) ("section 2244(d) does not permit the reinitiation of the limitations period that has ended before the state petition was filed").

Accordingly, the federal petition filed in 2007 was five years late. It must be dismissed as untimely.

<sup>1.</sup> The Ninth Circuit has interpreted California law to mean that the California Supreme Court's summary denial of a habeas petition is not final for 30 days. *Allen v. Lewis*, 295 F.3d 1046 (9th Cir. 2002) (en banc); *Bunney v. Mitchell*, 262 F.3d 973 (9th Cir. 2001). However, effective January 1, 2003, the state rules made clear that such rulings are final immediately. Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.532(b)(2)(C). As the ruling in petitioner's case was before that date, he is entitled to the additional 30 days, although it ultimately does not affect the statute of limitations question.

26

27

28



Case Information

Velcome

**6th Appellate District** 

Change court

Search

Court data last updated: 02/28/2008 03:05 PM

E-mail

<u>Case Summary</u> <u>Docket Scheduled Actions Briefs</u> <u>Disposition</u> <u>Parties and Attorneys</u> <u>Trial Court</u>

Calendar

Belp Docket (Register of Actions)

Opinions

The People v. Vallejo Case Number <u>H021879</u>



Date	Description	Notes
08/22/2000	Motion for relief from default filed.	for failure to timely file a notice of appeal
08/24/2000	Opposition filed.	by AG to mtn for relief from default
08/25/2000	To court.	mtn for relief from default and opposition
08/28/2000	Received document entitled:	Reply to Oppo to Applic for Relief from Default (tct perm to file)
08/29/2000	Reply filed to:	Oppo to Applic for Relief from Default (SDAP) (perm to file gtd by PJ)
09/06/2000	Order filed.	the application for relief from default is denied.
09/06/2000	Case complete.	
09/1.5/2000	Received copy of Supreme Court filing.	Copy of petition for writ of habeas corpus that was filed in the supreme court.
04/12/2001	Received copy of Supreme Court filing.	oppo by ag to petition for writ of habeas corpus.
04/24/2001	Received copy of Supreme Court filing.	reply to brief in opo to petition for writ of habeas
03/12/2003	Filed letter from:	apInt asking for status of his case. Sent him a copy of docket sheet.
10/19/2004 Shipped to state retention center, box # / list #:		199/79

Click here to request automatic e-mail notifications about this case.

@2007 Judicial Council of California



Case Information

Supreme Court **Supreme Court** 

Change court

Z

Wel come

Attention: Supreme Court database and email registration will be offline from 8:00PM Friday, February 1 to 7:00AM Monday, February 4 for server maintenance. Your patience is appreciated.

E-mail

Search

Court data last updated: 01/30/2008 08:53 AM

Calendar

<u>Case Summary Docket Briefs</u> <u>Disposition Parties and Attorneys Lower Court</u>

Help ——— Opinions

**Docket (Register of Actions)** 

C|C

VALLEJO (FLORENCIO P.) ON H.C.

Case Number <u>S091526</u>

Date	Description	Notes	
09/14/2000	Petition for writ of habeas corpus filed	petnr by counsel.	
03/27/2001	Informal response requested	from sf ag. due 4/11. 10 days for reply.	
04/11/2001	Informal response filed	Attorney General	
04/20/2001	Filed:	pentr's reply to informal response	
07/25/2001	Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied		

Click here to request automatic e-mail notifications about this case.

© 2007 Judicial Council of California

Filed 03/04/2008

CLOSED, HABEAS, ProSe

### **U.S. District Court** California Northern District (San Francisco) CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 3:04-cv-03090-JSW

Vallejo v. Zavala et al

Assigned to: Hon. Jeffrey S. White

Cause: 28:2254 Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (State)

Date Filed: 07/29/2004

Date Terminated: 11/29/2004

Jury Demand: None

Nature of Suit: 530 Habeas Corpus

(General)

Jurisdiction: Federal Question

**Petitioner** 

Florencio Vallejo

represented by Florencio Vallejo

Salinas Valley State Prison

P.O. Box 1030 Soledad, CA 93960

PRO SE

V.

Respondent

G. Zavala

Respondent

The People of the State of California

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
07/29/2004	1	PETITION for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Filing fee \$ 5.IFPP). Filed by Florencio Vallejo. (hdj, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 7/29/2004) (Entered: 08/03/2004)
07/29/2004	2	MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis filed by Florencio Vallejo. (hdj, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 7/29/2004) (Entered: 08/03/2004)
07/29/2004	3	CLERK'S NOTICE re completion of In Forma Pauperis affidavit or payment of filing fee due within 30 days. (hdj, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 7/29/2004) (Entered: 08/03/2004)
08/09/2004	4.	MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis filed by Florencio Vallejo. (hdj, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 8/9/2004) (Entered: 08/11/2004)
·		

11/29/2004	5	ORDER DISMISSING Habeas Petition for Failure to Exhaust State Remedies Signed by Judge Jeffrey S. White. Denying 2 4 Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis. (hdj, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 11/29/2004) (Entered: 12/01/2004)
11/29/2004	6	JUDGMENT: The Court has dismissed this pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus without prejudice for failure to exhaust state remedies. A judgment of dismissal is entered. The clerk shall close the file. Signed by Judge Jeffrey S. White on 11/29/04. (hdj, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 11/29/2004) (Entered: 12/01/2004)
12/08/2004		Mail Returned as Undeliverable. Mail sent to Florencio Vallejo. (hdj, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 12/8/2004) (Entered: 12/14/2004)

PACER Service Center			
Transaction Receipt			
02/29/2008 09:13:40			
PACER Login:	dj0082	Client Code:	, ,
Description:	Docket Report	Search Criteria:	3:04-cv-03090-JSW
Billable Pages:	1	Cost:	0.08



Case Information

Welcome **6th Appellate District**  Change court

Search

Court data last updated: 02/28/2008 03:05 PM

E-mail

Case Summary Docket Scheduled Actions Briefs **Disposition** Parties and Attorneys Trial Court

Calendar

Help

**Docket (Register of Actions)** 

Opinions

In re VALLEJO on Habeas Corpus Case Number H030932

home

Date	Description	Notes
11/30/2006	Petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed.	
01/04/2007	Case fully briefed.	
01/04/2007	Order denying petition filed.	The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied (P, E, WD)
01/04/2007	Case complete.	
03/07/2007	Record purged - to be shipped to state records center.	

Click here to request automatic e-mail notifications about this case.

@2007 Judicial Council of California



Case Information

Supreme Court

**Supreme Court** 

Change court

Welcome

Attention: Supreme Court database and email registration will be offline from 8:00PM Friday, February 1 to 7:00AM Monday, February 4 for server maintenance. Your patience is appreciated.

E-mail

Search

Court data last updated: 01/30/2008 08:53 AM

Calendar

Case Summary Docket Briefs

He1p

Disposition Parties and Attorneys Lower Court

Opinions

**Docket (Register of Actions)** 

home

VALLEJO (FLORENCIO P.) ON H.C.

	er <u>5149489</u>	Notes
Date	Description	
01/17/2007	Letter sent to:	Petitioner to submit application for relief from default. (Defective petition returned with letter)
04/26/2007	No application for relief/default submitted - case closed	

Click here to request automatic e-mail notifications about this case.

@ 2007 Judicial Council of California

### **DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY MAIL**

Case Name: Florencio Vallejo v. Adams

Case No. C 07-4536 JSW

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the Bar of this Court at which member's direction this service is made. I am familiar with the business practice at the Office of the Attorney General for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business.

On March 4, 2008, I served the attached

### MOTION TO DISMISS HABEAS CORPUS PETITION AS UNTIMELY

in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General,455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000, San Francisco, California 94102, for deposit in the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business in a sealed envelope, postage fully prepaid, addressed as follows:

Florencio P. Vallejo P-71999 SATF P.O. Box 5242 Corcoran, CA 93212

I declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration	was
executed on March 4, 2008, at San Francisco, California.	

Denise Neves	/s/ Denise Neves
	Signature